

Appl. No. 09/824,654
Amdt. dated April 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2003

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2 and 6 have been amended and claims 7-16 have been added; and claims 1-16 remain pending.

Objection re: Specification

The specification is objected to in that (1) it does not contain the serial numbers of related applications as identified on page 1, and (2) line 17 on page 4 is incomplete. The specification has been amended as described above and is therefore now deemed to be in compliance.

35 USC 101 Rejection

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 101 on the basis that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter; more specifically, that claim 6 claims a computer program product per se and does not positively recite that the program is stored on a medium that can be read by a machine. Claim 6 has been amended as described above and is therefore now deemed to be in compliance with respect to 35 USC 101. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing rejection be withdrawn.

35 USC 112 Rejection

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention; more specifically, claim 6 recites the limitation "the method" in line 7. Claim 6 has been amended as described above and is therefore now deemed to be in compliance with respect to 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing rejection be withdrawn.

35 USC 102 Rejection

Appl. No. 09/824,654
Amdt. dated April 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2003

PATENT

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bensoussan et al. ("Bensoussan", U.S. Patent No. 6,581,068). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejection and submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 1, it is alleged that Bensoussan discloses all of the limitations as recited in claim 1. Upon further review, Applicants respectfully submit that Bensoussan does not disclose at least one or more limitations as recited in claim 1. For example, the cited excerpt, col. 6, lines 43-51, merely teaches that organizations require complex hierarchies to be defined along several dimensions; such teaching is a generally known fact in the OLAP culture. This is clearly different from displaying a reporting object that displays values selected by one or more axes of the multidimensional data model. In addition, the cited excerpt, col. 7, lines 31-35, merely discloses a commonly known fact about the OLAP data model, which is that data items can be categorized in multiple ways; such fact is commonly captured in the concept of multiple hierarchies for a single dimension. This is clearly different from displaying a set of reporting objects, each corresponding to a member of the dimension, where the reporting object displays values of measures of the corresponding dimension member including multiple blocks synchronized along a common axis, nested sections, and breaks. Hence, at least for the reasons stated above, claim 1 is deemed to be patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 6, the same arguments and rationale as discussed above in connection with claim 1 similarly apply with equal force. Hence, claim 6 is also deemed to be patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claims 2-5, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and hence at least derive their respective patentability therefrom. Without conceding the issue of patentability and in the interest of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicants submit that these claims are deemed to be patentable over the cited art.

New Claims

Claims 7-16 have been added as described above. It is believed that these claims are fully supported by the specification and do not introduce any new matter. It is further

Appl. No. 09/824,654
Amdt. dated April 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2003

PATENT

believed that the cited art does not disclose or suggest the various limitations as recited in these claims and that, therefore, these claims are patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Horace H. Ng
Reg. No. 39,315

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
HHN:hhn
60191683 v1